

FE–BE coupling for a Transmission Problem Involving Microstructure

H. Gimperlein, M. Maischak, E. Schrohe, E. P. Stephan

Abstract

We analyze a finite element/boundary element procedure to solve a non-convex contact problem for the double-well potential. After relaxing the associated functional, the degenerate minimization problem is reduced to a boundary/domain variational inequality, a discretized saddle point formulation of which may then be solved numerically. The convergence of the Galerkin approximations to certain macroscopic quantities and a corresponding a posteriori estimate for the approximation error are discussed.

1 Introduction

Adaptive finite element / boundary element procedures provide an efficient and extensively investigated tool for the numerical solution of uniformly elliptic transmission or contact problems. However, models of strongly nonlinear materials often lead to nonelliptic partial differential equations, where the standard Hilbert space techniques are no longer appropriate to analyze the computational methods. In a previous work [8] we showed that certain mixed $L^2 - L^p$ -Sobolev spaces provide a convenient setting to study contact problems for monotone operators like the p -Laplacian. This article extends the approach to nonconvex functionals, discussing the prototypical model case of a double-well potential in Signorini and transmission contact with the linear Laplace equation. As a proof of principle, it intends to clarify the mathematical basis – including well-posedness, convergence, a priori and a simple a posteriori estimate – of adaptive finite element / boundary element methods in this highly degenerate nonlinear setting. The methods readily extend to certain systems of equations from nonlinear elasticity, frictional contact or more elaborate a posteriori estimates.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded Lipschitz domain and $\partial\Omega = \overline{\Gamma_t} \cup \overline{\Gamma_s}$ a decomposition of its boundary into disjoint open subsets, $\Gamma_t \neq \emptyset$. We consider the problem of minimizing the functional

$$\Phi(u_1, u_2) = \int_{\Omega} W(\nabla u_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^c} |\nabla u_2|^2 - \int_{\Omega} f u_1 - \langle t_0, u_2|_{\partial\Omega} \rangle$$

with nonconvex energy density $W(F) = |F - F_1|^2 |F - F_2|^2$ ($F_1 \neq F_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$) over the closed convex set

$$\{(u_1, u_2) \in W^{1,4}(\Omega) \times W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega^c) : (u_1 - u_2)|_{\Gamma_t} = u_0, (u_1 - u_2)|_{\Gamma_s} \leq u_0, u_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2\},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \left\{ \left\{ v \in W_{loc}^{1,2}(\Omega^c) : \Delta v = 0 \text{ in } W^{-1,2}(\Omega^c), v = \begin{cases} o(1) & , n = 2 \\ \mathcal{O}(|x|^{2-n}) & , n > 2 \end{cases} \right\} \right\}.$$

The data $f \in L^{4/3}(\Omega)$, $t_0 \in W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ and $u_0 \in W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ are taken from the appropriate spaces.

Classical exact minimizers of Φ satisfy the equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div} DW(\nabla u_1) &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \Delta u_2 = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega^c, \\ \nu \cdot DW(\nabla u_1) - \partial_\nu u_2 &= t_0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad u_1 - u_2 = u_0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_t, \\ u_1 - u_2 &\leq u_0, \quad \nu \cdot DW(\nabla u_1) \leq 0, \quad \nu \cdot DW(\nabla u_1)(u_1 - u_2 - u_0) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_s, \\ &+ \text{ radiation condition for } u_2 \text{ at } \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the minimization problem for Φ is a variational formulation of a contact problem between the double-well potential W and the Laplace equation, with transmission (Γ_t) and Signorini (Γ_s) contact at the interface.

Nonconvex minimization problems of this type arise naturally when a material in Ω passes the critical point of a phase transition into a finely textured mixture of locally energetically equivalent configurations of lower symmetry, the so-called microstructure. Lacking convexity in Ω , the minimum of Φ is usually not attained. Nevertheless, it is possible and of practical interest to extract average physical properties of the sequences minimizing Φ . Examples of such quantities include the displacement in the exterior, stresses, the region, where minimizing sequences develop microstructure, or also the gradient of the displacement away from the microstructure. Crucially for the use of boundary elements, the exterior boundary value on the interface is not affected by the presence of microstructure.

The increasingly fine length scale of the microstructure often prevents the direct numerical minimization, and starting with works of Carstensen and Plecháč [3, 4] computational approaches based on *relaxed* formulations have been considered. Relaxation amounts to replacing the nonconvex functional by its quasi-convex envelope, in our setting the degenerate functional

$$\Phi^{**}(u_1, u_2) = \int_{\Omega} W^{**}(\nabla u_1) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega^c} |\nabla u_2|^2 - \int_{\Omega} f u_1 - \langle t_0, u_2|_{\partial\Omega} \rangle.$$

If $A = \frac{1}{2}(F_2 - F_1)$ and $B = \frac{1}{2}(F_1 + F_2)$, the convex integrand W^{**} is given by the formula (cf. [3])

$$W^{**}(F) = \left(\max\{0, |F - B|^2 - |A|^2\} \right)^2 + 4|A|^2|F - B|^2 - 4(A(F - B))^2.$$

The theory of relaxation for nonconvex integrands shows that the weak limit of any Φ -minimizing sequence minimizes Φ^{**} . Macroscopic quantities like the stress DW^{**} on Ω defined by this weak limit coincide with the averages such as

the average stress $\int DW(u) \, d\nu(u)$ defined by the Young measure ν associated to the minimizing sequence. To extract the average physical properties of sequences minimizing Φ , it is thus sufficient to understand the minimizers of the degenerately convex functional Φ^{**} .

We are thus going to analyze a finite element / boundary element scheme which numerically minimizes Φ^{**} and thereby approximates certain macroscopic quantities independent of the particular minimizer. Our approach is based on previous works by Carstensen / Plecháč [3, 4] and Bartels [1] for double-well potentials with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. Section 2 discusses the relaxed problem and identifies several quantities shared by its minimizers. A priori error estimates for their computation and convergence are established in Section 3. Section 4 contains an a posteriori estimate of residual type, on which an adaptive grid refinement strategy may be based.

For later reference, we recall from [3] the following estimates for the relaxed double-well potential ($E, F \in \mathbb{R}^n$):

$$\max\{C_1|F|^4 - C_2, 0\} \leq W^{**}(F) \leq C_3 + C_4|F|^4, \quad (1)$$

$$|DW^{**}(F)| \leq C_5(1 + |F|^3), \quad (2)$$

$$|DW^{**}(F) - DW^{**}(E)|^2 \leq C_6(1 + |F|^2 + |E|^2)(DW^{**}(F) - DW^{**}(E))(F - E), \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} 8|A|^2|\mathbb{P}F - \mathbb{P}E|^2 + 2\frac{Q(F) + Q(E)}{|A|}|A(F - E)|^2 + 2(Q(F) - Q(E))^2 \\ \leq (DW^{**}(F) - DW^{**}(E))(F - E) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $Q(F) = \max\{0, |F - B|^2 - |A|^2\}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the subspace of vectors orthogonal to A .

2 Analysis of the Relaxed Problem

We first outline how the minimization problem for Φ^{**} can be reduced to a boundary-domain variational inequality. As it involves the exterior problem, it is not affected by the nonconvex part of the functional. See e.g. [8] for a more detailed exposition.

Recall the Steklov–Poincaré operator

$$S : W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega),$$

a positive and selfadjoint operator (pseudodifferential of order 1, if $\partial\Omega$ is smooth) with defining property

$$\partial_\nu u_2|_{\partial\Omega} = -S(u_2|_{\partial\Omega})$$

for solutions $u_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2$ of the Laplace equation on Ω^c . Let

$$\widetilde{W}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s) = \{v \in W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega) : \text{supp } v \subset \bar{\Gamma}_s\}, \quad X = W^{1,4}(\Omega) \times \widetilde{W}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s).$$

Using S , an affine change of variables,

$$(u_1, u_2) \mapsto (u, v) = (u_1 - c, u_0 + u_2|_{\partial\Omega} - u_1|_{\partial\Omega}) \in X,$$

for a suitable $c \in \mathbb{R}$ reduces the exterior part of Φ^{**} to Γ_s :

$$\Phi^{**}(u_1, u_2) = \int_{\Omega} W^{**}(\nabla u) + \frac{1}{2} \langle S(u|_{\partial\Omega} + v), u|_{\partial\Omega} + v \rangle - \lambda(u, v) + C \equiv J(u, v) + C,$$

where

$$\lambda(u, v) = \langle t_0 + Su_0, u|_{\partial\Omega} + v \rangle + \int_{\Omega} f u$$

and $C = C(u_0, t_0)$ is a constant independent of u, v . Therefore, instead of Φ^{**} one may equivalently minimize J over

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(u, v) \in X : v \geq 0 \text{ and } \langle S(u|_{\partial\Omega} + v - u_0), 1 \rangle = 0 \text{ if } n = 2\}.$$

A reformulation as a variational inequality reads as follows: Find $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\int_{\Omega} DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}) \nabla(u - \hat{u}) + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), (u - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + v - \hat{v} \rangle \geq \lambda(u - \hat{u}, v - \hat{v}) \quad (5)$$

for all $(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}$.

Convexity and the closedness of $\mathcal{A}$ assure that the relaxed functional J assumes its minimum. Due to the lack of coercivity, the minimizer may fail to be unique, though certain macroscopic quantities are uniquely determined.

Lemma 2.1. *The set of minimizers is nonempty and bounded in X . The stress $DW^{**}(\hat{u})$, the projected gradient $\mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u}$, the region of microstructure $\{x \in \Omega : Q(\nabla\hat{u}) = 0\}$ and the boundary value $\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}$ are independent of the minimizer $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{A}$ of J (up to sets of measure 0).*

For the proof, we recall the variant

$$\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,4}(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\nabla\hat{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega)} + \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_t)} \quad (6)$$

of Friedrichs' inequality from [8].

Proof of Lemma 2.1. By (1) and the coercivity of S , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |J(\hat{u}, \hat{v})| &\geq C_1 \|\nabla\hat{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^4 - C_2 \text{vol } \Omega + \frac{1}{2} C_S \|\hat{u}|_{\Gamma_s} + v\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} C_S \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_t)}^2 - \|f\|_{L^{4/3}(\Omega)} \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,4}(\Omega)} \\ &\quad - \|t_0 + Su_0\|_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \|\hat{u}|_{\Gamma_s} + \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)} \\ &\quad - \|t_0 + Su_0\|_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_t)} \end{aligned}$$

for any minimizer $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{A}$ of J . Consequently

$$\|\nabla\hat{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^4 + \|\hat{u}|_{\Gamma_s} + \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)}^2 + \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_t)}^2 - C \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,4}(\Omega)}$$

is bounded for some $C > 0$. The inequality (6) easily yields the boundedness of $\|(\hat{u}, \hat{v})\|_X$.

If $(\hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_1), (\hat{u}_2, \hat{v}_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ are two minimizers, J is constant on $\{(\hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_1) + s(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_2 - \hat{v}_1) : s \in [0, 1]\}$: If not, the restriction of J to this set would have a maximum $> J(\hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_1) = J(\hat{u}_2, \hat{v}_2)$ for some $0 < s < 1$, contradicting the convexity of J . Therefore

$$\langle J'(\hat{u}_2, \hat{v}_2) - J'(\hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_1), (\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_2 - \hat{v}_1) \rangle = 0,$$

or for our particular J

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\Omega} (DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1) \\ &\quad + \langle S((\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_2 - \hat{v}_1), (\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_2 - \hat{v}_1 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Both of the terms on the right hand side are non-negative, because S is coercive and W^{**} convex, and hence

$$\hat{u}_1|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_1 = \hat{u}_2|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad (DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1) = 0$$

almost everywhere. The inequality (3),

$$|DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)|^2 \lesssim (1 + |\nabla \hat{u}_2|^2 + |\nabla \hat{u}_1|^2) (DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1),$$

implies $DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1) = DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2)$ almost everywhere. The assertions about the projected gradients and the region of microstructure are immediate consequences of inequality (4),

$$|\mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_2 - \mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_1|^2 + (Q(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - Q(\nabla \hat{u}_1))^2 \lesssim (DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1).$$

□

In particular, the displacement $\hat{u}_2$ on Ω^c is uniquely determined and may be computed from $\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}$ with the help of layer potentials. Due to the lack of convexity of W , neither $\hat{u}$ nor $\nabla \hat{u}$ needs to be unique. However, Lemma 2.1 allows to identify subsets of Ω , on which these quantities are well-defined.

Corollary 2.2. *a) Let $\Omega_{t,A}$ be the set of points $x \in \Omega$ for which the component of a hyperplane perpendicular to A through x intersects Γ_t . Then the displacement $u|_{\Omega_{t,A}}$ is independent of the minimizer.*

b) The same holds for the gradient $\nabla \hat{u}$ outside the region of microstructure.

Proof. The proof closely follows the arguments of [3], Theorem 3.

a) Let $(\hat{u}_1, \hat{v}_1), (\hat{u}_2, \hat{v}_2) \in \mathcal{A}$ be two minimizers, and consider $w = \hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1$. Because $\mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_1 = \mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_2$, ∇w is parallel to A almost everywhere. It is easy to see that, therefore, w may be modified on a set of measure zero to yield an absolutely continuous function which is locally constant along the hyperplanes perpendicular to A . With $w|_{\Gamma_t}$ being 0 by Lemma 2.1, w also has to vanish on almost every hyperplane hitting Γ_t .

b) is a consequence of $\mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_1 = \mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_2$, $DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1) = DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2)$ and (4):

$$(Q(\nabla \hat{u}_2) + Q(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) |A \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1)|^2 \lesssim (DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_2) - DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u}_1)) \nabla(\hat{u}_2 - \hat{u}_1).$$

□

3 Discretization and A Priori Estimates

We are now going to analyze which quantities can be computed numerically with a Galerkin method.

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_h\}_{h \in I}$ a regular triangulation of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ into disjoint open regular triangles K , so that $\overline{\Omega} = \bigcup_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} K$. Each element has at most one edge on $\partial\Omega$, and the closures of any two of them share at most a single vertex or edge. Let h_K denote the diameter of $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and ρ_K the diameter of the largest inscribed ball. We assume that $1 \leq \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{h_K}{\rho_K} \leq R$ independent of h and that $h = \max_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} h_K$. $\mathcal{E}_h$ is going to be the set of all edges of the triangles in $\mathcal{T}_h$, D the set of nodes. Associated to $\mathcal{T}_h$ is the space $W_h^{1,4}(\Omega) \subset W^{1,4}(\Omega)$ of functions whose restrictions to any $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ are linear.

$\partial\Omega$ is triangulated by $\{l \in \mathcal{E}_h : l \subset \partial\Omega\}$. $W_h^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ denotes the corresponding space of piecewise linear functions, and $\widetilde{W}_h^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)$ the subspace of those supported on Γ_s . Finally, $W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega) \subset W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$,

$$\mathcal{A}_h = \mathcal{A} \cap (W_h^{1,4}(\Omega) \times W_h^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega))$$

and $X_h^4 = W_h^{1,4}(\Omega) \times \widetilde{W}_h^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)$.

We denote by $i_h : W_h^{1,4}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{1,4}(\Omega)$, $j_h : \widetilde{W}_h^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s) \hookrightarrow \widetilde{W}^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\Gamma_s)$ and $k_h : W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega) \hookrightarrow W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ the canonical inclusion maps. A discretization of the Steklov–Poincaré operator is defined as

$$S_h = \frac{1}{2}(W + (I - K')k_h(k_h^* V k_h)^{-1} k_h^* (I - K))$$

from the single resp. double layer potentials V and K and the hypersingular integral operator W of the exterior problem. S_h is well-known to be uniformly coercive for small h in the sense that there exists $h_0 > 0$ and an h -independent $\alpha_S > 0$ such that for all $0 < h < h_0$

$$\langle S_h u_h, u_h \rangle \geq \alpha_S \|u_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2.$$

Furthermore, in this case

$$\|(S_h - S)u\|_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \leq C_S \operatorname{dist}_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}(V^{-1}(1 - K)u, W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)) \quad (7)$$

for all $u \in W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ and all $0 < h < h_0$.

As before, $(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$ denotes a minimizer of J over $\mathcal{A}$, while $(\hat{u}_h, \hat{v}_h)$ minimizes the approximate functional

$$J_h(u_h, v_h) = \int_{\Omega} W^{**}(\nabla u_h) + \frac{1}{2} \langle S_h(u_h|_{\partial\Omega} + v_h), u_h|_{\partial\Omega} + v_h \rangle - \lambda_h(u_h, v_h),$$

$$\lambda_h(u_h, v_h) = \langle t_0 + S_h u_0, u_h|_{\partial\Omega} + v_h \rangle + \int_{\Omega} f u_h,$$

over $\mathcal{A}_h$. For simplicity, abbreviate the stress $DW^{**}(\nabla \hat{u})$ by σ and the indicator $Q(\nabla \hat{u})$ for microstructure by ξ . Similarly, write σ_h and ξ_h for the corresponding quantities associated to $\hat{u}_h$. The following a priori estimate holds.

Theorem 3.1. *The Galerkin approximations of the stress σ , exterior boundary values $u|_{\partial\Omega} + v$ and the other quantities in Lemma 2.1 converge for $h \rightarrow 0$.*

a) *There is an h -independent $C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|\mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2}A\nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq C \inf_{(U_h, V_h) \in \mathcal{A}_h} \left\{ \|u - U_h\|_{W^{1,4}(\Omega)} + \|(u - U_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + v - V_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \right\} \\ & \quad + \text{dist}_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}(V^{-1}(1-K)(\hat{u} + \hat{v} - u_0), W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega))^2. \end{aligned}$$

b) *For pure transmission conditions, $\Gamma_t = \partial\Omega$, the slightly better estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 + \|\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2}A\nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \leq C \inf_{U_h \in \mathcal{A}_h} \left\{ \|\nabla\hat{u} - \nabla U_h\|_{L^4(\Omega)}^2 + \|\hat{u} - U_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \right\} \\ & \quad + \text{dist}_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}(V^{-1}(1-K)(\hat{u} - u_0), W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega))^2 \end{aligned}$$

holds.

Proof. We integrate (3) and use Hölder's inequality as well as the uniform bound on the norm of minimizers (the first assertion in Lemma 2.1) to obtain

$$\|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 \lesssim \int_{\Omega} (\sigma - \sigma_h) \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h). \quad (8)$$

Most of the remaining terms on the left hand side are similarly bounded with the help of (4):

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2}A\nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_{\Omega} (\sigma - \sigma_h) \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h). \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

Adding the inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned} LHS^2 & := \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|\mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla\hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2}A\nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \int_{\Omega} (\sigma - \sigma_h)(\nabla\hat{u} - \nabla\hat{u}_h) + \langle S(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h, (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h \rangle \\ & = - \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla\hat{u}_h - \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), \hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h \rangle \\ & \quad - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla\hat{u} - \langle S(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h), \hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} \rangle \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla\hat{u} + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), \hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} \rangle \\ & \quad + \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla\hat{u}_h + \langle S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h), \hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle (S - S_h)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h), \hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(U, V) \in \mathcal{A}$, $(U_h, V_h) \in \mathcal{A}_h$. Applying the variational inequality (5) to the third and fourth line and rearranging terms leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS^2 &\lesssim \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla(U - \hat{u}_h) + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), U|_{\partial\Omega} + V - \hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} - \hat{v}_h \rangle \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla(U_h - \hat{u}) + \langle S(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h), U_h|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} - \hat{v} \rangle \\
&\quad + \lambda(\hat{u} - U, \hat{v} - V) + \lambda(\hat{u}_h - U_h, \hat{v}_h - V_h) \\
&\quad + \langle (S - S_h)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0), (\hat{u}_h - U_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - V_h \rangle \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla(U - \hat{u}_h) + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), (U - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + V - \hat{v}_h \rangle \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla(U_h - \hat{u}) + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), (U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v} \rangle \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} (\sigma_h - \sigma) \nabla(U_h - \hat{u}) + \langle S((\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}), (U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v} \rangle \\
&\quad + \lambda(\hat{u} - U, \hat{v} - V) + \lambda(\hat{u}_h - U_h, \hat{v}_h - V_h) \\
&\quad + \langle (S - S_h)(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - u_0), (\hat{u}_h - U_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - V_h \rangle \\
&\quad + \langle (S - S_h)((\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}), (\hat{u}_h - U_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - V_h \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Hölder's inequality tells us that

$$\int_{\Omega} (\sigma_h - \sigma) \nabla(U_h - \hat{u}) \leq \|\sigma_h - \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla(U_h - \hat{u})\|_{L^4(\Omega)},$$

and the continuity of S allows to bound

$$\langle S((\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}), (U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v} \rangle$$

by a multiple of

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \|(U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \\
&\lesssim \varepsilon \|(\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \|(U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2
\end{aligned}$$

for small $\varepsilon > 0$. Similarly, the last two lines are, up to prefactors, bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varepsilon \|(\hat{u}_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + (1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \|(U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \\
&+ \|(S - S_h)(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - u_0)\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, choosing $(U, V) = (\hat{u}_h, \hat{v}_h)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS^2 &\lesssim \|\sigma_h - \sigma\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla(U_h - \hat{u})\|_{L^4(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + \|(U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|(S - S_h)(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - u_0)\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \int_{\Omega} \sigma \nabla(U_h - \hat{u}) + \langle S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}), (U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v} \rangle - \lambda(U_h - \hat{u}, V_h - \hat{v}).
\end{aligned}$$

If $\Gamma_t = \partial\Omega$, the variational inequality (5) becomes an equality, the last line vanishes and b) follows. In the general case, we estimate the last line by

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)} \|\nabla(U_h - \hat{u})\|_{L^4(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)} \|U_h - \hat{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega)} \\ & + \|S(\hat{u}|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - u_0) - t_0\|_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \|(U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

recalling that

$$\lambda(U_h - \hat{u}, V_h - \hat{v}) = \langle t_0 + Su_0, (U_h - \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + V_h - \hat{v} \rangle + \int_{\Omega} f(U_h - \hat{u}).$$

□

In particular, we can stably compute the approximate solutions in the exterior domain from $\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h$.

4 Adaptive Grid Refinement

In order to set up an adaptive algorithm, we now establish an a posteriori estimate of residual type. It allows to localize the approximation error and leads to an adaptive mesh refinement strategy. A related and somewhat more involved estimate for the linear Laplace operator with unilateral Signiorini contact has been considered in [9].

Let $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{A}$, $(\hat{u}, \hat{v}_h) \in \mathcal{A}_h$ solutions of the continuous resp. discretized variational inequality. We define a simple approximation $(\pi_h \hat{u}, \pi_h \hat{v}) \in \mathcal{A}_h$ of $(\hat{u}, \hat{v})$ as follows: $\pi_h \hat{u}$ is going to be the Clement interpolant of $\hat{u}$, and $\pi_h \hat{v} = \hat{v}_h$.

The next Lemma collects the crucial properties of Clement interpolation (see e.g. [2]).

Lemma 4.1. *Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and $E \in \mathcal{E}_h$. Then with $\omega_K = \bigcup_{\overline{K'} \cap \overline{K} \neq \emptyset} K'$ and $\omega_E = \bigcup_{\overline{E'} \cap \overline{E} \neq \emptyset} E'$ we have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{u} - \pi_h \hat{u}\|_{L^4(K)} & \lesssim h_K \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,4}(\omega_K)}, \\ \|\hat{u} - \pi_h \hat{u}\|_{L^2(E)} & \lesssim h_E^{1/2} \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\omega_E)}. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to prove the following a posteriori estimate:

Theorem 4.2.

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 + \|\mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2} A \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\ & \lesssim \eta_{\Omega} + \eta_C + \eta_S + \text{dist}_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}(V^{-1}(1-K)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0), W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_\Omega &= \sum_K h_K \|f\|_{L^{4/3}(K)} + \sum_{E \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset} h_E \|[\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h]\|_{L^2(E)} , \\
\eta_C &= \eta_{C,1} + \eta_{C,2} = \sum_{E \subset \Gamma_s} \|(\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_+\|_{L^2(E)} + \sum_{E \subset \Gamma_s} \int_E (\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_- \hat{v}_h , \\
\eta_S &= \sum_{E \subset \partial\Omega} h_E^{1/2} \|S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0) + (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) - t_0\|_{L^2(E)} .
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.3. a) Also the constant prefactors, suppressed in our notation $\lesssim$, are explicitly known.

b) The main point of this estimate is to show that the a posteriori estimates for the contact part ([9]) and the double-well term ([3]) are compatible. More sophisticated bounds related to a different choice of π_h generalize to our setting in a similar way. As a simple case, a more considerate (sign-preserving) choice of $\pi_h \hat{v}$ with $\|\hat{v} - \pi_h \hat{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_s)} \lesssim h^\alpha \|\hat{v}\|_{L^2(\Gamma_s)}$ could be used to gain an h^α in $\eta_{C,1}$ at the expense of modifying

$$\eta_{C,2} = \sum_{E \subset \Gamma_s} \int_E (\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_- \pi_h^1 \hat{v}_h ,$$

as long as we only assure that $\int_E (\pi_h \hat{v}_h - \hat{v}) \leq \int_E \pi_h^1 \hat{v}_h$ for some auxiliary interpolation operator π_h^1 (see e.g. [9]).

c) As in [8], it is straight forward to introduce an additional variable on the boundary to obtain estimates that do not involve the incomputable difference $S_h - S$. Similarly, we might also use the formulation of Bartels [1] with explicit Young measures in the interior part.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we start with the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS^2 &:= \|\sigma - \sigma_h\|_{L^{\frac{4}{3}}(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}^2 \\
&\quad + \|\mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u} - \mathbb{P}\nabla \hat{u}_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|(\xi + \xi_h)^{1/2} A \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\xi - \xi_h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\lesssim \int_\Omega (\sigma - \sigma_h) \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h) + \langle S((\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h), (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h \rangle .
\end{aligned}$$

Using the variational inequality and its discretized variant results in

$$\begin{aligned}
LHS^2 &\lesssim \lambda(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h, \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h) - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h) - \langle S(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h, (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h) \\
&= \lambda(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h, \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h) - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla(\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h) - \langle S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h, (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h) \\
&\quad + \langle (S_h - S)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h, (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h) \\
&\leq \lambda(\hat{u} - u_h, \hat{v} - v_h) - \int_{\Omega} \sigma_h \nabla(\hat{u} - u_h) - \langle S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h, (\hat{u} - u_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - v_h) \\
&\quad + \langle (S_h - S)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0), (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h \rangle \\
&= \int_{\Omega} f(\hat{u} - u_h) - \sum_{E \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset} \int_E [\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h](\hat{u} - u_h) \\
&\quad - \langle S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0) + (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) - t_0, (\hat{u} - u_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - v_h \rangle \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_s} (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) (\hat{v} - v_h) \\
&\quad + \langle (S_h - S)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0), (\hat{u} - \hat{u}_h)|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \hat{v}_h \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

for all $(u_h, v_h) \in \mathcal{A}_h$. Here, ν_E and $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ denote the outward-pointing unit normal vector to an edge $E \subset \overline{K}$, resp. to $\partial\Omega$, and $[\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h]$ is the jump of the discretized normal stress across E . According to estimate (7) for $S_h - S$ and Young's inequality, the last term contributes the not explicitly computable $\text{dist}_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}(V^{-1}(1-K)(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h), W_h^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega))^2$.

We are going to choose $(u_h, v_h) = (\pi_h \hat{u}, \pi_h \hat{v})$. Then, the first three terms on the right hand side can be estimated with the help of Lemma 4.1 and Hölder's inequality:

$$\int_{\Omega} f(\hat{u} - \pi_h \hat{u}) \leq \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{1,4}(\Omega)} \left(\sum_K h_K^{4/3} \int_K |f|^{4/3} \right)^{3/4},$$

$$\left| \sum_{E \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset} \int_E [\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h](\hat{u} - \pi_h \hat{u}) \right| \leq \|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} \left(\sum_{E \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset} h_E \int_E |[\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h]|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\langle S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0) + (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) - t_0, (\hat{u} - \pi_h \hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v} - \pi_h \hat{v} \rangle| \\
&\leq (\|\hat{u}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|\hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|\hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}) \|S_h(\hat{u}_h|_{\partial\Omega} + \hat{v}_h - u_0) + (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) - t_0\|_{W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the boundedness of the set of minimizers, Lemma 2.1, provides an explicit uniform bound on both $\|\hat{u}, \hat{v}\|_X$ and $\|\hat{u}_h, \hat{v}_h\|_X$ in terms of the norms of the data. The $W^{-\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)$ -norm leads to η_S ([5]).

The remaining term requires a slightly more precise analysis. Decompose

$$(\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h) = (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h)_+ - (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h)_-$$

into its positive and negative parts. For a classical exact solution, the Signorini condition requires $(\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma)_+ = 0$, and we estimate the corresponding term as above:

$$\left| \int_{\Gamma_s} (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h)_+ (\hat{v} - \pi_h \hat{v}) \right| \lesssim (\|\hat{v}\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)} + \|\hat{v}_h\|_{W^{\frac{1}{2},2}(\partial\Omega)}) \left(\int_{\Gamma_s} |(\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_+|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

For the negative part, we may drop the unknown term:

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{\Gamma_s} (\nu_{\partial\Omega} \cdot \sigma_h)_- (\hat{v} - v_h) &= \sum_{E \in \Gamma_s} (\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_- \int_E (v_h - \hat{v}) \\ &\leq \sum_{E \in \Gamma_s} (\nu_E \cdot \sigma_h)_- \int_E \hat{v}_h. \end{aligned}$$

The a posteriori estimate follows. $\square$

References

- [1] S. Bartels, *Adaptive Approximation of Young Measure Solutions in Scalar Nonconvex Variational Problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 42 (2004), 505–529.
- [2] S. C. Brenner, L. R. Scott *The Mathematical Theory of Finite Element Methods*, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [3] C. Carstensen, P. Plecháč, *Numerical Solution of the Scalar Double-Well Problem Allowing Microstructure*, Math. Comp. 66 (1997), 997–1026.
- [4] C. Carstensen, P. Plecháč, *Numerical Analysis of Compatible Phase Transitions in Elastic Solids*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. 37 (2000), 2061–2081.
- [5] C. Carstensen, E. P. Stephan, *Adaptive coupling of boundary elements and finite elements*, RAIRO Modél. Math. Anal. Numér. **29** (1995) 779–817.
- [6] B. Dacorogna, *Direct Methods in the Calculus of Variations*, Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [7] H. Gimperlein, M. Maischak, E. Schrohe, E. P. Stephan, *A Finite Element/Boundary Element Coupling Method for Strongly Nonlinear Transmission Problems with Contact*, Oberwolfach Reports 5 (2008), 2077–2080.
- [8] H. Gimperlein, M. Maischak, E. Schrohe, E. P. Stephan, *Adaptive FE–BE Coupling for Strongly Nonlinear Transmission Problems with Coulomb Friction*, preprint (2009).
- [9] P. Hild, S. Nicaise, *A Posteriori Error Estimations of Residual Type for Signiorini’s Problem*, Numer. Math. 101 (2005), 523–549.
- [10] P. Pedregal, *Parametrized Measures and Variational Principles*, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1997.